

tience, and fortitude of the Polish people in their persistent struggle to regain independence.

Heroic Poland gave us the best and most inspiring modern example of sacrifice for Christian principle in that terrible engagement with the Communists in 1920. The Polish people proved then to the world that they were among the very, very few who early recognized the planned and determined Kremlin objective of reducing the free world to pagan slavery. Would that we had wisely learned from their example and the recent years of too much appeasement and too often retreat, of developing world confusion and of increasing turmoil, might well have been avoided.

The price the Polish people paid for their early courageous resistance to Communist attack was catastrophic and the blow was even more severe when it appeared that their supposed allies turned their backs upon and heads away from their cruel plight under Soviet subjugation and tyranny. The debt the free world owes to heroic Poland for her courageous struggle against the Communist horde 41 years ago still remains unpaid and will remain a blot upon the moral integrity of this country and the United Nations until it is paid.

That is why we as Americans must never relax our efforts to help the Polish people to reestablish their freedoms under their own chosen government. As a nation dedicated ourselves to the democratic principles of personal liberty and individual freedom, the U.S. Government has an obligation to unceasingly maintain the right of Poland to her independence and persevere, both as an individual nation and as a member of the United Nations, in demanding that the Communist leaders grant freedom and independence to Poland. We can do no less and still call ourselves a Christian democratic country while we join in prayer that the day will soon come when Poland, and all the other enslaved nations, will once again happily enjoy their personal and national freedom.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, drawn up shortly after our own Declaration of Independence and Constitution, stands as a great document of human rights, social justice, religious toleration, a contribution of the Polish people to the heritage of freedom.

By its adoption, Polish leaders hoped to lead their countrymen from the feudal path of the Middle Ages to the broad democratic highways of modern times. Through the abolition of the crying political evils of the old regime and by granting protection of the law to the peasantry, increased freedom of action to the middle and lower classes, the Constitution of May 3 sounded the keynote of that love of freedom and willingness to fight for it so characteristic of the people of Poland.

You do not teach one of Polish blood love of freedom and justice; it is in his blood.

The Constitution was welcomed by all the people of Poland, and it was hailed by all friends of Poland. The whole liberal world regarded it as the greatest

advance made in governmental system in modern Poland. But it seems that Poland's enemies, not her friends, were the first to profit by this encouraging step. The autocracies of Austria, Prussia, and Russia, fearing that through this constitution Poland might regain her former strength, and thus make it difficult for them to carry out their hostile designs against Poland, hastened to make war upon her. In the ensuing war, Poland was defeated, partitioned, and of course both Poland's independence and her democratic Constitution became victims of her foes.

But the spirit of democracy, of independence and freedom, embodied in that document did not die; they lived in the hearts and minds of millions of patriotic and gallant men and women of Poland.

The spirit of freedom and justice embodied in the Constitution of May 3, 1791, has been woven into the fabric of American freedom, which is our proudest heritage. Beginning with Jamestown, where the Polish settlers proved such an asset to the first English colony, saving it from starvation by their competent, industrious, and patient work, the contribution of Poland is part of the history of America.

In the war of the American Revolution, Kosciuszko and Pulaski fought for our independence. Kosciuszko liberated many Negroes with the net proceeds from the sale of his governmental grant.

During the Civil War, Polish names are found in the list of freedom fighters. Gen. Vladimir Krzyzanowski is the most famous, but there were many others. Gen. Joseph Karga, Capt. Alexander Bielwaski, Capt. Joseph Gloskowski, Capt. Louis Zychlinski, Capt. Peter Krolbasa—later city treasurer of Chicago. In our list of freedom fighters we must pay tribute to Sister Veronica. She and her sister, also a Mercy nun, nursed the sick and the dying on the battlefields and in the military hospitals. Perhaps they may be regarded as the precursors of the Grey Samaritans, Polish-American women, many of whom went from Chicago to nurse the pestilence-stricken, homeless and crippled families of Poland during World War I.

Love of freedom, service of God and country are Polish characteristics from which my own city of Chicago has profited. Chicago is the largest Polish-American city in the country. In its growth, civic, social, and economic development it owes much to the honest, courageous and industrious labors of its noble Polish population. The Polish-American has blended his culture, his religion, and social qualities into the life of the city. The center of his community is the parish church, the school, the home, the press.

The first Polish conservatory of music was established in Chicago in 1870. The Polish Roman Catholic Union has headquarters in Chicago. In its office building are housed the Polish Archives and museum; its library and reading room have the largest collection of books on Poland in the English language.

The Polish Women's Alliance, with its home office in Chicago, has its own library and museum. The alliance grants

scholarships, conducts recreation centers. During two World Wars they sent vast material and financial aid to countless orphans, homeless men and women in Poland and other parts of Europe. The Polish Civilian War Relief formed the largest production unit of the American Red Cross.

The Polish Alma Mater was founded in 1897 by the Reverend Francis Gordon, brother of the late beloved chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the Honorable Thomas S. Gordon, to promote Christian ideals, standards and Polish culture among the youth of America. The Polish Welfare Association was organized to combat juvenile delinquency and antisocial attitudes. Through systematic casework by trained workers they have done invaluable work particularly in the juvenile, women's, domestic relations, and boys' courts.

On this Polish Constitution Day we pay tribute to the 170th anniversary of the promulgation of that document of human freedom. We remind ourselves, however sketchily, that the spirit of that Constitution has been woven into our own American history, is part of our heritage. It would be ironical to recall that the country, which could produce that Constitution, whose people have been a dynamic force in our American life, is now a captive of Russian imperialism, unless we can believe that the spirit never dies. The Polish people will never desert their goal, freedom, liberty, and national independence. Some day Poland will shake off the shackles of Soviet domination and take her place among the free nations of the world.

And here today in the historic Chamber of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States we renew our pledge of stout and unfailing friendship to the brave and noble people of Poland in their struggle, which can end only in triumph, their struggle to break from Soviet chains and give to the world of freedom the strength and the inspiration of an independent and sovereign Poland.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, 1791, there was promulgated in the kingdom of Poland, a constitution, setting forth principles which would initiate a democratization of the kingdom. This document came about, not through bloodshed as had happened in France, but through peaceful means. And in this bloodless revolution lies the irony of Polish history. For today, we commemorate a document which ceased to exist before it was universally proclaimed, a document which has been fought for in horrendous uprisings, a document which today is only a symbol.

Poland ceased to exist in 1795 by the final partitioning of the surrounding powers. Its nationalistic spirit, though, grew as the years passed. Great artists continued to represent a Polish nation. Every note of Frederick Chopin's marches and polonaises sounded Polish liberty. His concert tours in behalf of his people overtaxed his strength and he became another in a long list of Polish martyrs.

It was left, though, to another eminent pianist to see the rebirth of a new Polish

6760

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

May

nation. Ignace Paderewski worked tirelessly for his fellow countrymen and became their chosen head at the peace conferences concluding the first World War. For his unceasing labors, he was rewarded with the premiership of the newly created Polish nation.

With the rise of nazism, Germany, aided by Communist Russia, once more proceeded to conquer and divide Poland. Throughout the Second World War, though, the Free Polish soldiers fought well against the tyrannical powers, fighting for their country, marching to their national anthem, "On! On! From Italy's fair plain. Lead us on to greet our homeland; lead us back again."

Though a Poland still exists today, it exists in name only. Russian mastery controls its every move; Russian military might prompts the Polish Government to adhere to the Communist doctrine. But even today the courage of the Poles come forward. Some of their leaders, particularly Cardinal Wyszynski, have dared to speak and act against the present regime. Polish resistance erupts occasionally to cause international sympathy.

The people in Poland cannot celebrate their Constitution Day. We in the United States must honor it for them. We salute their Constitution so that it may always be remembered as a lamp of freedom for the oppressed peoples of the world.

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

(Mr. HIESTAND (at the request of Mr. SHORT) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, the debacle in Cuba has created a furor which is going to continue for some time. On the part of the United States, there were a number of tactical errors, not the least of which are already accepted by the President.

We do not want to display a disunited front in this situation but, surely, an observation seems altogether proper—and necessary.

Can you imagine the consternation of a Cuban, only hours before the revolt, hearing our President and Secretary of State state emphatically that the United States would not come to his aid? It undoubtedly put the damper on a general uprising. And then, a short time later, President Kennedy quite strongly said the United States would not sit idly by as communism advanced into this hemisphere. What is the Cuban's reaction now? Where was help when it was needed?

Next in this strange and danger-torn drama came the President speaking about the "lessons we've learned" from the popped balloon in Cuba. Let us hope we have secured a quick education.

I would specifically like to speak to you today about the Central Intelligence Agency. There has been an apparent movement to shift the entire blame for the Cuba mess on the shoulders of the CIA. This is wrong for high administration officials must share some of the blame.

However, the CIA's role in the invasion failure is under attack as well as CIA activity in general. The charges are somewhat unclear because of the very nature of the CIA's work—secrecy, of course, being an important factor.

Nonetheless, we can maintain a proper check and balance on the CIA without destroying the necessity for secrecy. The CIA now operates unchecked, and, oftentimes, off balance. And it does it with a blank check.

Nobody, not even Members of Congress, knows what the CIA spends. A recent newspaper report pegged it at \$7 billion. I cannot agree with that but some estimates run higher than that. Nobody knows and, in the light of many charges, whether the Agency is even effective.

Even now, the President has called on the Attorney General and Gen. Maxwell Taylor to review our paramilitary and intelligence activities.

I hope this is not merely a smoke-screen to cover up errors made at the White House but a sincere attempt to pinpoint CIA mistakes—if there are any.

Just what is the CIA doing? Is it being effective? Is the cost worth it?

Is it worth \$2 million to purchase a hotel in a major middle eastern city in order to bug several rooms in the hope an enemy agent might stop there? That, I understand, was a CIA proposal some years ago.

Is it worthwhile to buy a drive-in movie theater, bugging all the car speakers, in the hope an enemy's conversation might be picked up among 200? That, too, was reportedly a CIA suggestion which fortunately got the axe before it went too far. These stories are significant if they reflect general CIA policy.

Historically, the Congress keeps an eye on the purse string. This, uniquely, is not the case with the CIA. And are we getting results worth the cost?

Look within the CIA itself: a special department was reportedly established, consisting of three persons. Within 3 years, this department had grown from those 3 persons to 400 and was costing millions to operate. Is this to go unchecked?

For these reasons, I have today introduced a concurrent resolution, establishing a joint House-Senate committee to study and investigate the foreign intelligence activities of the Central Intelligence Agency.

Some bills in the past have put the FBI in the picture. I do not feel the FBI, which is doing a magnificent job, is of concern here. This resolution is concerned only with the CIA and its foreign intelligence operations. Although the committee would report to this Congress and dissolve, the resolution specifically directs the committee to look into the advisability of establishing a permanent joint committee to oversee the activities of the CIA and its expenditures.

We are concerned with three points. First, what is the goal of the CIA? Second, how will it achieve that goal? And, third, how much will it cost. Such a committee need not violate the necessary

secrecy. But it would look into the need for a proper measure of balance and restraint on such an important tool of our Government.

PRICE STABILITY MUST BE MAINTAINED

(Mr. JUDD (at the request of Mr. SHORT) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, it appears that there is a belated but increasing interest in achieving price stability in our country and I am reintroducing the bill which I first introduced in the 86th Congress to make price stability one of the goals of the Employment Act of 1946.

This legislation was specifically recommended by President Kennedy's special task force to analyze the current economic position of the United States with special attention to the balance of payments. The recommendation was submitted to Mr. Kennedy on January 18, 1961. On April 11, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, the Honorable William McChesney Martin, Jr., spoke out strongly and clearly on the need to stabilize the prices of our commodities if all segments of our population are to reap the benefits of our productive system and we are also to remain competitive with the rest of the world.

My bill would make the maintenance of relative price stability an explicit aim of Federal economic policy, as it is already implied in the language of the Employment Act that "it is the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power." Maximum purchasing power is not being promoted when price levels are increasing.

The bill would give an important mandate to the President's Council of Economic Advisers—to work for both maximum employment and a stable cost of living, not one at the expense of the other.

Somewhere along the line many in our country seem to have forgotten that often times the most beneficial use of increased productivity is not to increase wages and/or profits, but rather to reduce the price of the product.

In recent years the increased earnings resulting from improved machinery, techniques, and skills have been devoted almost solely to increasing wages to the workers and profits to the owners. In fact, in some years wages and/or profits have gone up more than the increase in productivity. The inevitable result is that the price of the product goes up also and those consumers with fixed income—this is particularly cruel for retired people who cannot go back to work to increase their income—suffer a reduction in their purchasing power. Those who receive the larger profits and wages from increased productivity have more purchasing power temporarily; but as prices go up, before very long they have no greater purchasing power than before and everybody else has less.

But to the extent that increased productivity is used to reduce the price of the product, everybody gets an increase in purchasing power. The worker gets

A3026

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

May 3

Kaplan directed to the editor of the Washington Post and which skillfully puts the Cuban situation in proper perspective:

APRIL 21, 1961.

THE EDITOR,
Washington Post Newspaper,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: On several occasions in the past I have been tempted to communicate with you on certain points raised in your editorials with respect to U.S. policy toward Latin America. I did not succumb to that temptation on those occasions, but find that your editorial, "A Call to Duty," in your April 21, 1961 issue, impels me to try to set the issue of Cuba in proper and realistic perspective.

You state in that editorial, commenting on President Kennedy's message on Cuba to the American Society of Newspaper Editors, that "the President's lecture to the countries of Latin America was the weakest part of his message. The United States is not yet sufficiently identified with active movements for reform and social justice to make its concern about communism in Cuba altogether convincing. Here is the largest and most immediate challenge." You then go on to say in your editorial that the need also is for "simultaneous, cooperative effort in ideas and ideals to give our version of freedom more meaning to the landless peasant and disgruntled student."

Keeping in mind the objective of U.S. foreign policy toward Latin America so clearly enunciated by the President in his doctrine of *alianza para progreso*,¹ the portion of the President's talk on Cuba before the American Society of Editors which you find to be the weakest part of his message is indeed the strongest.

The question of intervention or nonintervention is not involved in the slightest. Intervention is an established fact—intervention in the hemisphere by international communism. Any action by the United States or Latin American countries to counter the impact of that intervention constitutes defense on behalf of the security of the Western Hemisphere. Further, it would constitute a removal of the greatest barrier to the achievement of the social and economic goals of *alianza para progreso* and to the identification of the United States "with active movements for reform and social justice," the absence of which identification you deplore. In the face of a triumphant international communism in Cuba, it is the very depth of naivete to imagine that this taste of success will be confined to the island of Cuba. As the strength and daring of international communism increases in the hemisphere, so does the opportunity for achievement of the economic and social goals referred to in your editorial diminish. *Alianza* would be limited to a few countries and *progreso* would be deliberately subverted by those who are more intensely devoted to spreading international communism than they are to a better life for our neighbors to the South.

While prior U.S. policy toward Latin America has been criticized for its disease of indifference to Latin America, and with justification, no real emphasis had been articulated on the role which our friends in Latin America must themselves play as equal partners with us toward the common goal, until the declaration and enunciation of the Kennedy doctrine of *alianza para progreso*. In his message to the editors, the President has rightly pointed out that the threat of international communism is a threat to the security of the hemisphere. It is precisely because President Kennedy must realize the futility of attempting to implement his doctrine of *alianza para progreso* while inter-

national communism is permitted to spread, that he has sounded the call to duty to Latin America itself as well as to our own Nation. Only if that call to duty is heeded will progress and the freedom of the Americas be achieved. Our Nation is prepared to heed that call to protect its security. The peoples of Latin America can do no less if they are to protect their own.

The President is to be commended for exhibiting his own profile in courage and for his refusal to tolerate the views of those more zealous in preserving a doctrine of nonintervention against the spreading and consuming conflagration of international communism than they are in preserving and developing free institutions in the Western Hemisphere.

To expect a successful *alianza para progreso* in the social and economic sectors in the face of this spreading conflagration would be akin to a husband hoping to teach his wife to drive with a time bomb under the hood. This, to me, is the essence of President Kennedy's lecture, as you call it, to the countries of Latin America. It is, in fact, the backbone of his call to duty.

Respectfully yours,

SHELDON Z. KAPLAN,
Formerly Staff Consultant, House Foreign Affairs Committee and Its Subcommittee on Latin America.

Safe for Ideas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the editorial, "Safe for Ideas," from the Washington Post of April 24, 1961.

Mr. Speaker, I was so impressed by the statesmanlike comment of Gov. Pat Brown of my State of California and the wise remark of Dr. Clark Kerr, president of the University of California, regarding the appearance of a particular speaker on the campus at Berkeley that I feel this editorial should be called to the attention of my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 24, 1961]

SAFE FOR IDEAS

The president of the University of California and the Governor of the Golden State have given what seem to us model statements of the importance of exposing students to controversy. A furor had arisen because a man convicted of contempt of Congress for refusal to answer questions about communism was invited to speak on the campus at Berkeley. Asked to intervene, Gov. Pat Brown of California refused, commenting: "Let the people say anything they want to. If they do anything criminal while they're speaking or after they're speaking, then they can be prosecuted." To this the university president, Dr. Clark Kerr, added: "The university is not engaged in making ideas safe for students; it is engaged in making students safe for ideas." This is an attitude which ought to hearten more timorous administrators, for it goes to the heart of a main purpose of education. If university training can't teach a student to be discreet and discriminating in his selection of ideas, artificial shielding won't help him.

Water in the Economy of the Red River Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT S. KERR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, one of the problems, often overlooked, we must face up to is water quality. Too often we think only in terms of quantity. My good friend, and a devoted servant of our Government, Gordon E. McCallum, Chief, Division of Water Supply and Pollution Control, Public Health Service, made a very fine talk to the 36th Annual Convention of the Red River Valley Association, Shreveport, La., on April 3.

I would like to share it with Senators, and therefore ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WATER IN THE ECONOMY OF THE RED RIVER VALLEY

(By Gordon E. McCallum, Chief, Division of Water Supply and Pollution Control, Public Health Service, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington D.C.)

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Congress, members and distinguished guests of the Red River Valley Association, it gives me much pleasure to be here today and participate in your 36th annual convention.

As an association which has functioned for this many years, I would guess that there are some second-generation members among you here today. In 36 years you have certainly witnessed significant changes in the face of your Red River Valley. Great man-made lakes such as Texoma have come into existence. Crops and land use have changed. Cities have spread out. Oil fields have developed—to name just a few. Dedicated as this group is to the fivefold purpose of navigation, soil conservation, reforestation, irrigation, and recreation—I have no doubt that this association has led in bringing about these great changes. It goes without saying that your efforts have lifted the living standards of those who dwell in this great river basin.

Your presence here today is testimony of your dedication to the comprehensive development of river basins. It was because of your interest that the Public Health Service, some 4 years ago, came in as a partner in one aspect of that development. Most of you have heard reports on our Arkansas-Red River basin water quality conservation project. At the risk of telling you things you already know, I should like to say a word about this project.

In simple terms, the project seeks to run down the major sources of pollution—brines that are degrading millions of acre-feet of water each year. Then we hope to propose ways to cut off those sources—so the waters will be suitable for domestic, industrial, and agricultural uses. Some 40 million acre-feet of salt polluted water is now passing through the Arkansas-Red River Basin each year—wasted for many purposes. Made usable, these waters can spell the difference between an economic impairment and unprecedented progress.

Each of us is becoming more concerned over our resources. President Kennedy emphasized this in his natural resources message to the Congress. In relation to water

¹ Alliance for progress.

the RECORD the results of the tabulation together with some of the comments included in the questionnaire:

Questionnaire returns

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, at this critical stage in inter-American relations, it is essential to have the views not only of qualified Government officials and of Members of Congress, but also of private citizens with knowledge and experience. Sheldon Z. Kaplan, who served with distinction for 8 years as staff consultant to the House Foreign Affairs Committee and also the Subcommittee on Latin America, is well known to the membership of this House as a topflight expert, in the true sense of the term, on foreign policy and Latin America. I commend to my colleagues the following letter which Mr.

A3042

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

May 3

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CUBA AS A SATELLITE

Any lingering doubts elsewhere about the complete Communist orientation of Cuba ought to be resolved by Fidel Castro's May Day harangue. The Cuban dictator has made it plain that his regime is an enthusiastic satellite—perhaps even more slavish than Mr. Khrushchev, for tactical reasons, might want. Dr. Castro's total repudiation of the elections he promised when he came to power and his renewed attacks upon the Catholic Church are links in the chain. It would be monstrous to think that these fetters represent the wish of the Cuban people.

All the same, Secretary Rusk's assurance that the United States has no plans for armed intervention in Cuba is a welcome indication that the administration has regained its balance. After the inglorious end of the invasion 2 weeks ago, American military action against Castro now would vastly compound the damage. That is one of the consequences of the initial failure. In present circumstances an attempt to expunge the menace by armed force would be prohibitively costly to this country's standing.

Mr. Rusk's testimony that the abortive invasion was a Cuban decision, however, will strike some persons at less than candid. Obviously Cubans carried out the landings. But the anti-Castro Cubans seem to have had relatively little voice in the planning and execution of the enterprise. No purpose is served by appearing to blame the anti-Communist Cubans for a fiasco that was in essence a piece of sad mismanagement by the United States.

At the same time, we think that former President Eisenhower has taken the right approach in advising against a "witch hunt" over the Cuban affair. It is altogether too evident that there were major miscalculations. It is essential that the administration and the country learn from them. But somewhat the same considerations are involved now as applied after the U-2 debacle a year ago. At that time the Senate Foreign Relations Committee conducted a highly responsible investigation that avoided needless turmoil.

Individual or agency accountability in the Cuban affair may exist. At best, however, an ex parte judgment can comprehend only a partial view; no one on the outside can know all the factors that went into recommendations and decisions. Much more important than pinpointing the blame is to institute changes in procedure and machinery so as to guard against such aberrations in the future.

Meanwhile the emphasis ought to be on isolating Castro. Even though this country's prestige in the hemisphere may have been injured temporarily by the Cuban flop, perhaps the net effect will still be that of catharsis—particularly if the United States moves quickly to give substance to its promises of economic help for self-help in promoting orderly change in Latin America. Castro himself is helping to promote an awakening. Until recently there was a tendency in some areas to dismiss the alarms about communism in Cuba as mere opposition to the reforms of a romantic revolutionary. But Castro's contempt for elections and his direct affirmation of ties to Moscow may have a different effect.

This, in turn, ought to bring more willingness on the part of other countries to enforce collective sanctions against the Castro regime—as has just been done in the exclusion of Cuba from the Inter-American Defense Board. A collective embargo, to be sure, would not have the same appeal to advocates of direct action as a military intervention or a blockade (which would be

difficult to enforce); and it must be conceded that the Communist hold on Cuba is likely to increase. But in view of the humilitation of the last fortnight, the first objective now ought to be to encourage broader understanding of the Communist enclave in Cuba and the dangers it presents.

Then, if Castro attempts to export subversion, it will be much easier to crack down with collective approval.

American Policy in the Near East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the recent exchange of fire between the Syrians and Israeli once again points to the festering sore in the Middle East. I am sure that we would all agree that it is the desire of all Americans to promote and establish peaceful and friendly relations between Israel and her neighbors in this most strategic part of the world.

With this thought in mind, it is well to give careful consideration to the statement of policy adopted by the American Israel Public Affairs Committee Conference held March 19 and 20. This organization's burning desire is to advance an Arab-Israel peace through a realistic approach to the many problems involved.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the committee, entitled "American Policy in the Near East" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN POLICY IN THE NEAR EAST

(A statement adopted by the American Israel Public Affairs Committee and submitted to the Department of State on March 20, 1961)

The American Israel Public Affairs Committee believes that the American people, gravely concerned over the hostilities which divide mankind and threaten its survival, have been heartened by the courageous and vigorous leadership of President John F. Kennedy.

We join with our fellow Americans in the determination to support the firm words uttered by President Kennedy in the hour of his inauguration: "Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, in order to assure the survival and the success of liberty."

The new administration is now reviewing American foreign policy in all parts of the world. The American Israel Public Affairs Committee hopes that this reappraisal will insure a firm policy in the Near East which will deter aggression, promote peace and economic development, and strengthen freedom.

We offer our support to the administration in the implementation of policies which will serve these objectives.

Since World War II, the United States has befriended Israel and the Arab States

and has helped them to raise the standards of living of their peoples.

The United States should continue to seek the friendship of these governments and encourage them to resolve their conflicts and befriend each other. In this process, however, our Government cannot be neutral between those who are for aggression and those who are for peace.

Neither the United Nations nor the United States has been able to induce the Arab States to terminate the state of war which they have maintained against Israel for 13 years in defiance of the United Nations 1947 Partition Resolution and in violation of the United Nations Charter. That state of war is deplorable, dangerous and a tragic waste of human and material resources.

Arab leaders use hatred for Israel as their badge of patriotism in the internal struggle for leadership in the Arab world. The massive military, economic and political support they receive from the Soviet bloc bolsters their ambition for military superiority and encourages their hope for victory. They wage a propaganda offensive to shift the blame and consequences for the Arab-Israel conflict to Israel in order to alienate other nations from Israel, disengage the West from vital moral and security commitments, reduce Western aid to Israel and ultimately isolate her.

FOR DIRECT NEGOTIATIONS

An Arab-Israel peace is a fundamental goal of U.S. policy in the Near East and our Government must continue a sustained effort to work for it, recognizing that peace can be attained only by direct negotiations between the Arab States and Israel.

Israel has repeatedly offered to negotiate directly with the Arab States. There is no reason why such direct negotiations should be indefinitely deferred. The United States should not be restrained by fear that working for peace will provoke Arab resentment. The Arab States can be induced to abandon their negative position only if our country and the U.N. are unwavering in the determination to outlaw the Arab war against Israel.

President Kennedy referred to the overriding world conflict in his inaugural address. His words are applicable to the Near East: "So let us begin anew—remembering on both sides that stability is not a sign of weakness, and sincerity is always subject to proof. Let us never negotiate out of fear. But let us never fear to negotiate."

We also recall, with satisfaction, President Kennedy's statement of August 25, 1960, that the United States must make it "crystal clear" that "we will act promptly and decisively against any nation in the Middle East which attacks its neighbor." The President deplored that neither Arabs nor Israelis "know exactly where we stand or exactly what we mean." We look forward to a new and positive statement that the United States will take decisive action to resist aggression in the Near East from whatever source.

THE BALANCE OF STRENGTH

Israel stands alone; she belongs to no defense system; no treaty automatically brings allies to her defense. While Israel's neighbors have been supplied with weapons from Communist sources, our Government has not provided grant military aid to Israel, and she has been compelled to expend large sums to purchase arms to defend herself. In the interests of world peace we favor disarmament in the Near East, under effective mutual inspection. As long as Israel is menaced by Soviet weapons in the hands of the Arab states, however, our Government and other Western allies must be vigilant to guarantee that the arms balance is maintained. This is indispensable to preserve stability in the Near East and to prevent an outbreak of hostilities.

1961

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A3041

We are convinced that our Boys' Town, once developed, will be a very strong deterrent to Communist infiltration here in Costa Rica and in due time throughout Central America. The time is more than ripe for our kind of work. What we are doing now for 64 boys will, God willing, be done later for hundreds, and ultimately for thousands.

Mr. Chairman, it is my hope that appropriate agencies of our Government will have the imagination to take the initiative when a worthwhile opportunity of this kind comes along and make Ciudad de los Niños a monument to the sincerity of our words and of our motives. Let Ciudad de los Niños become a showplace of democracy in America and fruitful realization of what the Latin American aid program can accomplish.

American Medical Association Survey of Federal Health Expenditures—VA and DOD—IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the following is the fourth part of a series on the report prepared by the American Medical Association on funds which have been appropriated by Congress for activities of the Federal Government in the field of health:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

(This year, \$1,015,389,000; last year, \$948,529,500).

Inpatient care in veterans' administration hospitals-----	\$766,445,000
Last year-----	751,440,000

Veterans' administration's largest single medical expenditure covers inpatient care in 171 veterans' administration hospitals and provides for an estimated 121,456 beds. At present veterans' administration reports an estimated daily patient load of 111,600, approximately 92 percent of bed capacity. The appropriation includes salaries of physicians and other personnel, medical rehabilitation of veterans, dietetic and nursing services, social services and special services, such as recreation and transportation of veterans.

Outpatient care-----	\$86,481,000
Last year-----	83,866,000

The bulk of this appropriation is for outpatient care in about 100 veterans' administration clinics. The remainder is planned for fees to physicians (\$8,965,000) and dentists (\$937,000) under the hometown care program.

Modernization and replacement construction-----	\$70,441,000
Last year-----	26,676,000

This amount is for work on existing units where costs exceed \$300,000 per project and equipment for new units. The money is available until expended (see "Alterations and improvements" item for small projects).

Domiciliary care-----	\$35,341,000
Last year-----	34,172,000

Domiciliary care is being provided in 18 VA facilities for about 18,850 veterans who, while incapacitated for employment, are not in

need of full hospital care. VA also makes payments to 33 State veterans homes with a daily patient load of approximately 9,750. Payments this fiscal year are estimated at \$6,513,000. Under Public Law 86-625 (86th Cong.) Federal contributions to these homes will be raised from a maximum of \$700 to \$912 a year per patient.

Medical research-----	\$22,500,000
Last year-----	18,344,000

For research, mostly in VA hospitals. The breakdown: general medical and surgical research, \$14,700,000; atomic medical research, \$3,250,000; prosthetics testing, \$1 million; neuropsychiatric, \$2,450,000; tuberculosis, \$900,000; other, \$200,000.

Contract hospitalization-----	\$15,235,000
Last year-----	15,277,000

This appropriation finances an average daily patient load of 3,050 veterans in Federal hospitals other than VA and in State and municipal hospitals. Patients in Federal non-VA hospitals are estimated at 1,407 and in non-Federal hospitals, 1,643. Mental cases make up the largest single category of contract cases.

Medical administration-----	\$8,896,000
Last year-----	8,177,000

To operate the Veterans' Administration Department of Medicine and Surgery in the central office and the seven area medical offices; included are salaries, travel, and like expenses.

Alterations, improvements, and repairs-----	\$4,559,000
Last year-----	4,983,000

For alteration, improvements and repairs to VA clinics and domiciliaries (costing less than \$300,000 per project).

Supply depot operations-----	\$2,500,000
Last year-----	2,263,500

For maintaining and operating supply depots handling the purchase, shipping and storage of medical supplies and equipment used by the Department of Medicine and Surgery.

Medical care—Philippine veterans-----	\$1,500,000
Last year-----	2,000,000

Until 1963 the United States will contribute for the medical care of Philippine veterans.

Medical education and training-----	\$1,491,000
Last year-----	1,331,000

For VA training programs for physicians and other VA personnel in medical specialties and auxiliary services.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

This year, \$803,462,100, last year, \$788,597,000.

Air Force medical services, approximately-----	\$363,442,000
Last year-----	339,761,000

The estimate for fiscal 1961 includes \$239,657,000 for the operation and maintenance of medical treatment facilities. This figure includes estimated expenses in connection with hospitalization, outpatient care, ancillary services, administrative support, and other medical services, including preventive medicine, veterinary, aeromedical evacuation, dental, physiological training, industrial health, medical training, payments to other Federal and nonfederal agencies for care provided Air Force active duty and retired personnel. Included are military salaries which constitute the largest portion of expenses. For the dependents' medical care program, the Air Force expects to spend in fiscal 1961 \$30,185,000. Major repairs and construction of medical

facilities is estimated at \$26,833,000. This figure includes amounts appropriated for fiscal 1960 which have not yet been obligated. Other medical expenses are estimated at \$66,787,000 and will be used to pay military students, and for medical printing and medical education, operation of staff functions at major air commands, subcommands, and the Office of the Surgeon General. This sum also include military salaries.

Army medical services, approximately-----	\$261,000,000
Last year-----	262,000,000

The estimated cost includes expenses normally associated with the operation of military hospitals and dispensaries, military and civilian salaries, medical supplies and equipment, utilities, communications, transportation travel subsistence, maintenance and repair of buildings and grounds, expenses for construction, dependent medical care, medical education and training, medical research and preventive medicine.

Navy medical services, approximately-----	\$178,884,000
Last year-----	186,824,000

The above estimate is broken down in the following manner: Military pay, \$62 million, maintenance and operation of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery activities, \$38,600,000; medical care nonnaval facilities, \$14 million; medicare, \$22,500,000; care of the dead, \$1,100,000; alteration or renovation, \$1,500,000; other costs, \$9,900,000; new construction \$500,000; research \$5,484,000; reimbursements, \$23,300,000. Not included in the above figures is the cost of operation of medical facilities not under the control of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery nor the salaries of military and civilian medical personnel at activities not under the management control of the BuMed or the military medical personnel attached to ships, fleet operating units and the Fleet Marine Force. These expenses are borne by the Bureau responsible for funding these activities.

Office Assistant Secretary of Defense—health and medical, approximately-----	\$136,100
Last year-----	120,000

For salaries, travel, and administration of this office, and for travel expenses and consultant fees for the Defense Department Civilian Health and Medical Advisory Council.

Cuba as a Satellite

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, there appeared in this morning's Washington Post an editorial entitled "Cuba as a Satellite." I think all of us can afford to read the editorial and profit from the same. I am sure we recognize the danger of Cuba, which is 90 miles away from our shores, becoming a satellite. We are not sure, but we have good reason to believe that several hundred Cubans are training to handle the airplanes that Castro hopes will be forthcoming from Russia.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed following my remarks in the Appendix of the Record.

6650

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

May 3

Furthermore, the record will show, I believe, that the one man who participated in the deliberations and pleaded with the President not to approve the plan was Senator FULBRIGHT. He foresaw what would happen, he warned the President that the right policy was not to attempt to oust Castro but to contain him while we worked constructively in Latin America. Senator FULBRIGHT was the only wise man in the lot.

When there is a disaster of this kind—as for example the British disaster at Suez—the mistake can be purged and confidence can be restored only by the resignation of the key figures who had the primary responsibility and by candid talk which offers the promise that the mistake will not be repeated.

In the immediate wake of the disaster the President took the position that he would accept all the blame and that nobody else was to be held responsible. This was generous. It was brave, and in the sense that the Chief Executive must stand by those under him, it was right. But it is not the whole story. Under our system of government, unlike the British system, the Chief Executive who makes a great mistake does not and cannot resign. Therefore, if there is to be accountability in our Government, the President must hold responsible those whose constitutional or statutory duty it is to advise him.

All this is a painful business, even for a hardened newspaper writer. But the stakes are very high and the national interest is that the truth be found and that justice be done. For there is at stake the confidence of our own people and of our friends throughout the world.

[From the Christian Science Monitor]
URGENT MOOD STALKS SAIGON
(By Takashi Oka)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM.—“We want President Ngo to succeed. But the way he is administering this country helps no one but the Communists.”

“Only the whirling electric fan punctuated my friend's discourse in his shuttered living room. A civil servant of more than 20 years' standing, he still occupied a responsible position within the South Vietnamese administration.

“No one wants a Communist South Vietnam,” he continued. “We all want to help the President. But I tell you frankly, civil service is approaching a state of utter demoralization.”

Outside, in the Saigon night, a tropical city was coming to life after a hot, dusty afternoon.

ELECTION QUIET

Election Day, April 9, had passed without serious trouble despite preelection forecasts of Communist-inspired riots and demonstrations. President Ngo had scored a victory officially approaching 90 percent of the vote cast nationwide, though in Saigon itself his percentage was 63.

Yet my friend, speaking several days after the election, was deeply troubled. His measured, cultivated French was at all times quiet and polite. Its tone of urgency was unmistakable.

In brief, he said South Vietnam's governmental structure might well be facing collapse, not so much because of Communist guerrillas and subversion as because of the President's authoritarianism and exclusive reliance upon a tight little group of close relatives and subordinates.

AUTHORITARIANISM

Authoritarianism, he said, was already apparent from the early years of the Ngo regime (Mr. Ngo came to power in 1954). Excessive preoccupation with the loyalty of his subordinates even at the expense of professional competence has come within the past 2 years, especially since the unsuccessful re-

billion last November led by paratrooper officers.

At the provincial level, my friend said civil governors of many years' experience had been replaced by young Army officers whose only qualification was loyalty to the President and membership in the elite Can Lao Nhan Vi, a clandestine political organization controlled by the President's brother, Ngo Dinh Nhu.

(Reporters who have traveled in the provinces support this statement. One observer was told by the Governor of Hue in central Vietnam that he was the only civilian left among the nation's 40 provincial governors. This reporter had an unilluminating conversation in Tay Ninh recently with a 35-year-old major who had replaced the civilian Governor there 11 months ago.)

In the central governments, not even cabinet ministers could appoint chiefs of bureaus without going through the Directorate of Social and Political Affairs—euphemistic title for the national security organ directly responsible to the President. Dr. Tran Kim Tuyen, the ascetic and intense director of this organization, is reputed to be one of South Vietnam's most powerful and mysterious figures. Like the President he is celibate and a devout Roman Catholic. “In short,” my friend said, “civil servants feel they are all under surveillance. So do army officers for that matter. There seems to be no logical basis for many appointments, and senior officials must often serve under men who are many years their junior.

REFORMS PROMISED

The President has promised reforms. He has promised decentralization of authority and reorganization of ministries. But so far, all we can see is reshuffling of forms. The basic question is whether or not the President trusts his own civil service. He has a pool of talented and experienced administrators. By misuse and nonuse of this pool he is needlessly creating silent, frustrated opposition.”

“Many of us are refugees from the north,” my friend concluded. “We fled from our homes 6 years ago precisely because we could not bear to live under Communist dictatorship. Here in the south we have a constitution, and we have the forms of democracy. I am a civil servant—I belong to no political party. All I ask for is that the President begin to give some substance to the forms that have been established.”

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask either the majority leader or the acting majority leader [Mr. SMATHERS] about the schedule for the remainder of the day. I ask this question because of the commitments which many Members have. I also wish to ask about the schedule for tomorrow and whether the Senate will convene early tomorrow.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, let me respond, on behalf of the majority leader, by saying that, because of the commitments, it is his intention to have the debate this afternoon continue until approximately 6 p.m.—presumably on the question of confirmation of the Holmes nomination; and then to have the Senate take a recess until 11 a.m. tomorrow, at which time the debate on the Holmes nomination will be continued, if the nomination has not previously been confirmed; and thereafter to have the Senate take up the conference

report on the judgeship bill and the German treaty; and, if those items are disposed of tomorrow, then to have the Senate take a recess until Monday.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it takes a recess until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

PLATFORM OF ILLINOIS YOUNG REPUBLICAN COLLEGE FEDERATION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on February 18, 1961, the Illinois Young Republican College Federation adopted a platform dealing with a great many matters. I think it is a very impressive document, and, accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that it be included in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the platform was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLATFORM OF ILLINOIS YOUNG REPUBLICAN COLLEGE FEDERATION, ADOPTED IN CONVENTION, FEBRUARY 18, 1961

PREAMBLE

We, the members of the Illinois Young Republican College Federation believe that the proper function of Federal Government is to maximize the freedom of the individual and to extend freedom around a world threatened by the forces of international communism.

Inherent in the proper execution of these functions, we believe—

That with the centralization of power in government comes an inevitable abuse of power which threatens individual initiative and constitutional liberties;

That government action should provide only a floor over economic disaster and not a ceiling for personal endeavor;

That our determined objective in the cold war must be victory over, rather than co-existence with, the godless and enslaving forces of world communism.

AGRICULTURE

We feel that the farm crisis caused by overproduction and low farm commodity prices calls for a realistic settlement. Our goal is an agricultural economy governed by the natural market laws of supply and demand. Believing that excessive Government intervention in farming only destroys the American spirit of free enterprise and places an unfair burden on the American taxpayer, we propose:

A greatly intensified land retirement program as the only effective way to eliminate excess production. We emphasize the retirement not of submarginal lands but productive land previously used to produce crops that are Government supported and our disapproval of rigid production quotas.

A voluntary farm resettlement program for farmers and their families who wish to seek employment in other fields. This would include a temporary relocation and vocational training program for farmers moving to cities and towns, and the use of skilled farmers and farmworkers as advisers and trainers in our foreign agricultural assistance programs.

The gradual elimination of our present \$9 billion commodity surplus. We advocate: (a) Reconversion of part of the surplus through research and technology aimed at the development of new industrial uses for farm commodities, (b) distribution of

1961

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

6649

trying to determine who are our neighbors and our friends in Latin America.

The time has come also, I believe, when we have the right to point out to our Latin American neighbors that they really have more to lose from Cuba's communism than does the United States.

We will be able to protect ourselves. We will be able to defend ourselves. If Russia wishes to follow an aggressive course of action in Cuba and attempt to take over Cuba as a Russian Communist beachhead, 90 miles from our shores, there is no doubt that we will meet that challenge directly, because then our own security will be involved.

DANGER IS TO REST OF HEMISPHERE

However, I point out to our Latin-American friends that their security can be endangered by Communistic infiltration from Cuba unless they are willing to stand now with those nations in the Western Hemisphere which are urging that we join together in a workable alliance this time, or in making the Organization of American States an effective, workable alliance, whereby we will cooperate, economically, politically, and militarily, if necessary, to prevent our friendly neighbors in Latin America from going down under the heel of Communist totalitarianism. This does not call for unilateral action on the part of the United States; it calls for joint action. It calls for a determination of policy. In my judgment, it calls for the appointment, in the immediate future, of an Assistant Secretary of State for Latin-American Affairs. It calls for the appointment, in the immediate future, of a U.S. Delegate to the Organization of American States.

Both of those offices are vacant at present. Such joint action calls, I say most respectfully, for some diplomatic consultation at the highest level between the United States and the Latin American countries, because I believe we owe it to ourselves and to the world—more important, we owe it to future generations—to exhaust every possibility of seeking to resolve the crisis which is developing throughout Latin America, by the maximum use of existing peaceful procedures. The sad fact is that we have not done that to date.

I close by expressing a great worry. In recent days I have listened, I have been briefed, and I think I have a reasonably accurate understanding of what happened. It does not augur well for the future of my country unless this administration will profit from the great mistake it has made in regard to the Cuban situation and will make perfectly clear to the country that we will not let the CIA and the Pentagon call the shots; we must not let preventive war groups in this country determine our policy.

I am greatly concerned about the increasing activity of what are undoubtedly powerful forces in this country which are urging a preventive war.

I am not interested in the incident they may use in order to cause that war, but I want to hear my President say, and to hear my Government make it clear, to the people of the country that we will not let those who have been guilty of giving the very bad advice

which this administration has received in the recent past create an incident or lead us into a situation which will result in what I am satisfied will be a completely unnecessary war, in order to defeat communism in the Western Hemisphere.

I raise my voice once more—although it will not be the last time—in opposition to those who write in the press, speak on the radio, or appear before the television, seeking to wave the American flag into tatters in an attempt to whip up a hysteria in this country for direct military action. If we start a war on a small scale, we can have no assurance that within a short time it will not break out into that holocaust which mankind ought to seek to avoid, if at all possible, with honor—a nuclear war—because out of that nuclear war will come no victory.

I think we need to face the fact that millions of people in many parts of the world—we do not like this ugly thought, but it exists throughout the world—fear two nations, in respect to the maintenance of peace. Those two nations are the United States of America and the Soviet Union.

Millions of people must be brought over to the side of freedom, but they will not come with us or will not go with the Russians until those two powerful military nations, now marching down the road of an immoral nuclear armament race toward inevitable utter destruction, can have reason brought to bear before it is too late.

Therefore, I should like to see more attention given in my country these days to the maximum use of existing peaceful procedures, in an attempt, at least, to find some way to bring these two powerful nations to an enforceable disarmament program; because until Russia and the United States are disarmed, the danger of nuclear war, in my opinion, will increase month by month.

Lastly, I hope we will proceed to erase, by action demonstrating our determination to promote peace in the world, our violation of our treaty commitments. I have given further study to the problem since my speech a week ago Monday, and I have no doubt in my mind that we have written on the pages of history for all generations of the future to read, that, unquestionably, we violated the Caracas Convention; we violated the Charter of the Organization of American States; we violated our own domestic law; and, I think, we violated at least one other treaty, possibly two other treaties, when we proceeded to give logistic support, financial support, and training support to a group of exiles who we knew were seeking to instigate a revolution in Cuba.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks an article entitled "Post Mortem on Cuba," written by Walter Lippmann and published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of May 2, 1961. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed following the Lippmann article, an article from the Christian Science Monitor on conditions in South Vietnam.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 2, 1961]

POST MORTEM ON CUBA

(By Walter Lippmann)

President Kennedy is in grave trouble. If after the appalling mistake of judgment in the Cuban venture, he allows himself to be sucked into the quibbels of Laos, he will have compromised, perhaps irrevocably, his influence on events. For the more he engages himself directly while the Soviet Union and China keep a free hand, the more he will weaken his influence.

The disaster in Cuba has opened the way to Chinese diplomatic intervention in the Lao negotiations. An American military entanglement in Laos would not only open the way to Chinese military intervention but would greatly aggravate the pressure on Iran, on Quemoy, and Matsu, and on our other exposed and vulnerable outposts, including probably West Berlin.

The United States would have committed the cardinal strategic error of dispersing its forces at places where there can be no decision while its adversary kept his forces concentrated and intact.

Though it is late, it is, let us hope, not too late to find our way back to the highway from which we have strayed.

To do this there will have to be a searching inquiry, which only the President can conduct, followed by a frank and convincing explanation of how so colossal a mistake was made.

The question is how the President decided to approve this venture which was, as the event has shown, so grossly misconceived. As I understand it, and contrary to the general impression, there was no serious expectation that the landing of the exiles would be followed immediately by a political uprising against Castro. The object of the landing was to establish a beachhead for a civil war against Castro, and no plans seem to have been made, no thought seems to have been given, to what we would do then, what the rest of Latin America would do then, what the Soviet Union would do, while the civil war was being fought.

Bad as have been the consequences of the failure, they are probably less bad than would have been the indecisive partial success which was the best that could conceivably have been achieved. For in order to support the rebellion in Cuba we would have had to continue to violate not only our treaties with the other American states but also our own laws which prohibit the preparation of foreign military expeditions in the United States.

My own inquiries as to how the misjudgment was made lead me to believe that the President was not protected by the new hands—Bundy, Rostow, Schlesinger, and Rusk—against the bad advice of the old hands, Bissell and Dulles of the CIA, Lemnitz and Burke of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Berle of the State Department. There is no doubt that the plans had been drawn up and the preparations made during the preceding administration. There is no doubt that the President insisted upon modifying these plans to avoid, as he thought and hoped, any appearance of direct involvement of the U.S. Armed Forces. Though much has been said that this proviso ruined the plan, there is no doubt also that the Chiefs of Staff and the CIA advised the President to proceed nevertheless.

I believe an inquiry will show that the Secretary of State although he had his misgivings, approved the plan. Contrary to much that has been said, I believe it to be true that Stevenson and Bowles were excluded from the deliberations which preceded the fatal decision.

May 3

6648

subject matter would leave the impression that the American people are ready to shoulder arms and proceed to subdue the Island of Cuba. It has been said that the White House mail has been four to one in support of direct military action against Cuba, but my mail has been over nine to one against it.

Typical of the reaction in this country on the part of those who do not agree with the course of action the administration has followed in the Cuban crisis is an editorial written by one of the most distinguished editors of our State, a former Governor of our State, a former Delegate in the U.S. delegation to the United Nations, a man who is recognized as one of the most ardent citizens of our State in support of the development of a system of international law for the settlement of disputes. Charles Sprague has demonstrated time and time again in his writings that he recognizes that we do not win peace through war, and that a powerful nation may have the military might to force its will for a time upon other parts of the world, but that history is replete with examples of failure on the part of powerful military nations to settle for very long problems that threaten the peace of the world by resorting to the use of military force.

I believe that the writing of Governor Sprague on this subject is so important that I intend to take the time of the Senate to read it into the Record. It is a needed check upon the urgings that have been submitted to us that we ought to invade Cuba. I cannot think of a greater mistake we could make. As I said, after our conferences with Secretary Rusk the other day, it is a matter of great relief to hear the Secretary of State make clear that there are no plans for an American invasion of Cuba based upon status quo conditions in Cuba.

That does not mean, as I said, that it may not be necessary, in case Russia follows a military aggressive course of action in Cuba, or in case Castro follows an aggressive military policy against American interests and rights, to protect our treaty obligations and our national rights by whatever means it becomes necessary to do so.

This great editor of the State of Oregon had this to say about the Cuban crisis:

President Kennedy's address to the American Society of Newspaper Editors on Thursday was a declaration of policy, pointed plainly to the U.S. military intervention in Cuba.

I believe the Governor is wrong in that conclusion, but he is right in warning the American people in this editorial that that would be a most unfortunate policy, and I associate myself with his observations. He goes on to say:

President Kennedy's address to the American Society of Newspaper Editors on Thursday was a declaration of policy, pointed plainly to U.S. military intervention in Cuba. He rattled our sabres, swinging one in the face of Khrushchev himself.

The addressed pleased the chauvinists and the activists who think we should come to grips with this Red infection in the Americas. But it will grieve those who oppose all war and disturb those who think that policy

outlined is wrong. I find myself in strong disagreement with the Kennedy proposal.

In his announcement of possible unilateral action the President based it on the primary responsibility for the security of our own Nation. Since Cuba itself offers no threat to the United States, his fear may arise over its possible use as a Russian base. That certainly would give us cause for concern; but it would be a logical counterpart to our own policy of ringing the Soviet Union and its China ally with bases for our strategic air arm. What are Formosa and Okinawa but forward bases for the United States whose retention we claim is necessary for American security? If use of Cuba as a base for Communist penetration of the mainland of North and South America is the motivation for possible intervention, the chance is great that such intervention would alienate the peoples of all Latin America, whose affection for the United States is not strong anyway.

The President's reference to the "bloody streets of Budapest" was not a fortunate allusion. What about bloody streets in Havana or Santiago or Santa Clara, blood shed by American bombs and shells? Would we not invite the opprobrium of other nations in the same way that Russia did for suppressing the Hungarian revolution? Presumably, if the United States did intervene militarily, we would promptly set up free elections, which Russia has not allowed in Hungary or its other satellites. But that would not purge us of the guilt of use of force against a people who of themselves have committed no grave acts against Americans. And if the new government restored American corporations to their former possessions the charge of imperialism would surely stick.

What we suffer most is injured pride. And Kennedy, who ran for office on the claim that the former administration had cost the Nation heavily in prestige, seems to think that the way to regain it is to wave, and evidently to use the big stick. So far his Cuban policy has come a cropper. The invasion which had the public blessing of the administration, and perhaps its undercover assistance, was quickly flattened out. It was poorly timed, poorly led, and lacked internal support.

I digress from the reading of the editorial to say that the testimony before my subcommittee by the Secretary of State, the head of CIA, and the Assistant Director of CIA, bear out Governor Sprague's statement completely. I repeat what he said:

It was poorly timed, poorly led, and lacked internal support.

He goes on to say:

Kennedy first announced that the affair was one of Cubans against Cubans. He should let it remain so, unless there is far greater provocation than we have yet experienced. But on Thursday he took the United States closer to the famous "brink" than his predecessor ever did.

Kennedy might look back to the invasion of the Suez by Israel, France and Britain in 1956, and note its outcome. Israel surely had more provocation for the invasion that we would have in Cuba, and Nasser was quite as great an annoyance to Britain and France as Castro is to the United States. But our government led the pack at United Nations to compel the invaders to withdraw. We were the great moralists then.

The parallel was noted by the Manchester, England, Guardian which offered this comment, before the Cuban invasion was launched:

"American intervention against Cuba would be as wrong—morally and politically—as Britain's intervention against Egypt in 1956. In the United States, the two sit-

uations doubtless seem different. In the rest of the world, they look ominously alike. Traditionally, Egypt was a quasi-colony of Britain—as Cuba traditionally was of the United States. A hostile Government in Egypt was a potential strategic threat to this country—as a hostile Government in Cuba is to the United States. In 1956, Britain claimed that President Nasser was, among other failings, a tool of the Kremlin—which is exactly what the United States now says about Dr. Castro. The effect of Britain's intervention against Egypt was to strengthen President Nasser, and to convince a large part of the world that Britain could not be trusted. American intervention against Cuba would have the same effect."

What shall we do, if we do not intervene? Exercise patience, and more patience—more because this administration has botched the job in its eagerness to get rid of Castro. Revolutions in Latin American countries do not succeed when launched from foreign bases. They succeed from an internal base, either in a military coup or in a popular uprising.

Castro's harsh rule would have led to one or the other. Now our policy has helped entrench him in power. Sure, we could send over some planes and ships and troops and run him out of the country. But Cuba and the Cubans would still be there, a majority hating us for liberating them; and the other Latins would cherish bitterness as they did for decades over our invasion of Mexico. The fruits of the good neighbor policy would wither in our hands.

Mr. President, this editorial was written by one of the most noted journalists in the West; it comes from one of the leading internationalists in the United States; it comes from a former member of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations; it comes, incidentally, from a man who is no political supporter of mine.

But when it comes to the realm of ideas, it does not make any difference to me from whose head the idea comes. If I think the idea is sound, I shall support the idea. In my judgment, the editor of the Salem Statesman, a former Governor of my State, made a contribution to commonsense in regard to the Cuban problem when he wrote this editorial of warning, as did Walter Lippmann in his column of yesterday. I shall not take the time to read it, but I wish to express this word of high praise to Mr. Lippmann because he has made a plea for calm judgment, he has made a plea for patience, he has made a plea for us to recognize, before it is too late, that the exercise of military might on the part of the United States against Cuba will not in any way resolve the great problems which confront freedom in Latin America but which, in my judgment, will only worsen the situation.

I have every confidence in the President and the Secretary of State. I feel certain that they will profit from the great mistake that was made; from the bad advice which obviously was given them; and from the miscalculation which, in my judgment, went into the fiasco which has come to be known as Cuban intervention.

I shall continue, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, to urge our Government to try to get together with our neighbors and our friends in Latin America. That involves

1961

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

6647

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nomination on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

C. Darwin Stolzenbach, of Maryland, to be Administrator of the National Capital Transportation Agency.

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce:

Ernest R. Feidler, for promotion to the permanent rank of rear admiral in the U.S. Coast Guard Reserve; and

Frank M. McCabe, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the U.S. Coast Guard.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Fulton Freeman, of California, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Columbia; and

John S. Everton, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Union of Burma.

AMBASSADOR TO IRAN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider the nomination of Hon. Julius C. Holmes, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iran.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Hickey in the chair). The nomination will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The nomination of Julius C. Holmes, of Kansas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iran.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the nomination of Julius C. Holmes to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iran.

OREGON SCHOOL FUNDS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, recently I received a letter from Mr. Cecil W. Posey, the executive secretary of the Oregon Education Association. In it he

discusses the situation in my State with respect to funds for education. He states:

As you may be aware, public school cost in Oregon as in other States will continue to rise and, at the present time, nearly 70 percent of the cost of schools in Oregon comes from a property tax. This simply cannot continue. The 1959 Oregon State Legislature did not increase its proportionate share of the cost of schools, and it is very doubtful that the present session of the Oregon Legislature will do very much.

We have reached an extremely critical situation. Public schools are needed in this Nation and yet the funds to provide them are drying up at the State and local level. We hope that the entire Oregon delegation will recognize the necessity of maintaining a good public school system not only for the welfare of the boys and girls, but for the very survival of our Nation.

I think Mr. Posey has summarized the situation very well. I would point out to my colleagues that while Oregon ranks among the top States in the effort it makes to support its school system, many qualified observers such as Mr. Posey believe that State and local tax sources have about reached the breaking point insofar as school support is concerned.

DEVELOPMENT OF A SOUND EDUCATION SYSTEM IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, one of the most distinguished educators in the State of Oregon is Dr. Frederick M. Hunter, honorary chancellor of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education.

He has written recently to President Kennedy expressing his support for the President's program to promote the development of a sound education system in the United States. I ask unanimous consent that the text of Dr. Hunter's letter to President Kennedy appear at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OREGON STATE SYSTEM
OF HIGHER EDUCATION,
Eugene, Oreg., February 24, 1961.

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President of the United States
White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KENNEDY: Your educational program, if enacted by the Congress, will prove the greatest bulwark and guarantee against the menace of communism ever proposed by the United States or any other nation. I earnestly hope for its speedy approval in toto.

I am a Republican, reared in a household where the unpardonable sin was not what Holy Writ says it is, but voting the Democratic ticket. But with millions of others, I am enthusiastically in favor of your constructive program for the defense of our free society and the complete realization of its aims to our own people. Every good citizen should support you vigorously in your great plan for the triumph of our way of life.

Very sincerely yours,
FREDERICK M. HUNTER,

Honorary Chancellor, Oregon State
Board of Higher Education.

REPEAL OF CONNALLY RESERVATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter I received from the Honorable Alfred T. Sulmonetti, chairman of the Oregon State bar committee on world peace through law. In it, Judge Sulmonetti advises me of the vote by the Oregon State bar at its 26th annual meeting in favor of repeal of the Connally reservation. His letter is an indication of the widespread interest in the legal profession in the establishment of world peace through law, and the wide support for positive and specific measures to achieve that objective.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OREGON STATE BAR,
April 6, 1961.

HON. WAYNE L. MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Subject: Senate Resolution 39 (87th Cong., 1st sess.), relating to recognition of the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in certain legal disputes hereafter arising.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The subject resolution (S. Res. 39) submitted to the Senate January 13, 1961, by you and Senators HUMPHREY and JAVITS came to the attention of the Oregon State bar committee on world peace through law, at its meeting at Eugene, Oreg., held March 24, 1961.

Adoption by the Senate of such resolution by concurrence of the requisite two-thirds majority would result in amendment of Senate Resolution 196 of the 79th Congress, 2d session (August 2, 1946), by eliminating the so-called self-judging or Connally reservation.

The purpose of this letter is to advise you that the Oregon State bar at its 26th annual meeting held at Gearhart, Oreg., on September 22, 1960, voted in favor of repeal of the Connally reservation.

Our committee feels this matter is very urgent and important. We want to encourage your efforts and, if you know of any way that our committee or its members can be of assistance in furthering the adoption of this resolution, please let me know.

Very truly yours,

ALFRED T. SULMONETTI,
Chairman, Oregon State Bar Committee on World Peace Through Law.

THE CUBAN SITUATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall take only 3 or 4 minutes to discuss three items that I shall insert in the RECORD, with very brief comment on them.

A week ago last Monday I spoke in the Senate of my disagreement with the policy of the administration with respect to the ill-fated attempted invasion of Cuba by Cuban exiles, financed and logistically supported by the United States. In my many years in the Senate I have never received such a public reaction to any speech I made in the Senate. My office has been literally flooded with comments from across this Nation, over 90 percent of which support the position which I expressed in my speech on the Cuban issue.

I cite this fact to the Senate because some of the columnists who are writing